

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. The specification has been modified to clarify the invention. Such modifications do not add new matter.

**Incorporation by Reference**

The Examiner seems to object to the incorporation by reference of the foreign application on page 1 of the present specification. However, Applicant respectfully points out that MPEP 201.13(a) clearly states that “An applicant may incorporate by reference the foreign priority application by including, in the U.S. application-as-filed, an explicit statement that such specifically enumerated foreign priority application or applications are “hereby incorporated by reference.” Further, Applicant is not attempting to introduce essential material by incorporating by reference the foreign priority application. Thus, the incorporation by reference of the foreign priority application on page 1 of the present specification is proper and should be maintained.

**Disclosure Objection**

The disclosure has been objected to because the Examiner alleges that it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code on page 6, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the specification. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the URIs provided on page 6 of the present application are merely examples of URI that can be concocted in implementing the present invention. These URIs are not real or active hyperlinks, but are hypothetical examples of URIs provided to better illustrate that printing parameters can be downloaded from a certain URI set by the web server 10. Plus, Applicant is not attempting to incorporate by reference the contents downloadable from these URIs since these URIs are hypothetical examples only and are not active in real life. Thus, the presence of these URIs is proper and the prohibition set forth in MPEP §608.01 does not apply to the present examples. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the disclosure objection are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (U.S. Patent 6,947,995). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 1, Chang does not disclose a method of configuring a printer. Instead, Chang discloses uploading capabilities and functionalities of a printer from the printer to an information apparatus (e.g., a mobile device) requesting such information. In clear contrast, according to the presently embodied invention, a set of printing parameters, which is adapted to a specific functional component of the printer, can be downloaded from a storage device over the Internet at a predetermined URI into the control unit of the printer. Thus, the set of printing parameters is transferred from the URI location to the printer. This flow of operation is complete opposite to the flow of uploading the object from the printer to the information requesting apparatus in Chang.

Furthermore in Chang, there is no “set of printing parameters, which is adapted to a specific functional component of the printer” as recited. Chang discloses a reference to an object; however, this disclosure does not have any relationship with the function of the URI as recited in claim 1. According to Applicant’s embodied invention, it is the address (URI) from which the printer accesses the set of printing parameters over the Internet to configure the printer using the downloaded printing parameters. This feature is completely absent from Chang.

Accordingly, Chang fails to teach or suggest at least the above-noted features corresponding to the claimed features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims (due to the dependency) are patentable over Chang, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on these reasons are respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goto (U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0047514). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 6, Goto is directed to a method wherein an upload and update instruction is issued from a maintenance management server through a public network to a first controller. This first controller instructs a remote console (RMC) to download the control program update from the control program update server. Then the RMC executes the download

of the control program from the control program upload server through the Internet. Then the downloaded control program is temporarily stored in the RMC and is transferred to the controllers. The update of the control program is executed in each controller and the maintenance center defines which program should be downloaded. The Examiner equates Goto's DKC as a printer recited in independent claim 6. In that case, however, Goto does not disclose "the control unit includes an Internet client for connecting to a URI at which the printing parameters are stored, and for loading the printing parameters into the memory" of the control unit of the printer, as recited in claim 6. Therefore, Goto fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 6 and its dependent claims (due to the dependency). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on these reasons are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Moreau (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0225757). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Hirota (U.S. Patent 4,661,822). Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto in view of Hirota and further in view of Chang. Claims 8, 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goto in view of Hirota as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Borg (U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0028308). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 6 from which dependent claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 depend, Chang does not disclose at least the above-noted features recited in independent claim 1 and Goto does not disclose at least the above-noted features recited in independent claim 6 as discussed above. Furthermore, the secondary reference(s) do not overcome these deficiencies in Chang or Goto as applied. Moreau is merely relied on for determining printing parameters based on certain measurements performed on samples associated with production series. Hirota is merely relied on for detecting whether a functional component has been interchanged. Borg is

directed to uploading (not downloading) the printing device data to a remote server at a site controlled by the manufacturer. The manufacturer can then analyze the data to obtain relevant information.

Therefore, even if these references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1 and 6 and their dependent claims (due to the dependency). Accordingly, the rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/085,765  
Amendment dated February 21, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2005

Docket No.: 0142-0377P  
Art Unit 2627  
Page 8 of 8

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By *Esther Choy #10,953*  
Raymond C. Stewart  
Registration No.: 21,066  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant